

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter in claim 8. In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-7 and 9-21 have been rejected under § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,925,097 (Gopinath). By this response, Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-21, and request reconsideration of the subject application.

Independent claim 1 requires “providing a first address to a first node such that **the first address includes a description of a path to the first node.**” These features are not taught by the cited art.

The Office action, in paragraph 2.1, has cited Fig. 21, col. 25, lines 1-11 “local VC number,” col. 34, lines 36-61, and col. 37, lines 8-18 in rejecting the above limitation of claim 1. Specifically, the Office action has quoted “local VC number” as teaching “**the first address includes a description of a path to the first node**” of claim 1. However, Gopinath in col. 25, lines 1-11 states “that the routing information is part of the VC state, which is accessed based on a local VC number of that port.”

Other sections of Gopinath describe that the “[t]he local name is denoted as the virtual circuit (VC)” (col. 23, lines 35-36). “The distribution elements uses local names for communication, private to each port (routing node), and the host at the periphery of the network” (col. 23, lines 26-28). Further, “[t]he one-to-one correspondence between local names of the neighboring nodes is established at the time of set-up the spanning tree” (col. 23, lines 29-32) and a “VC number is local for each port of the distribution element” (col. 37, lines 12-13). Therefore, it is clear by the cited and other portions of Gopinath that the VC number is local at a node and does not include “**a description of a path to the first node**” as recited by claim 1.

Further, according to Gopinath the VC number of a message is a pointer to a table where it is defined as “VC status,” (col. 33, lines 24-49) inside a node distribution element that contains the information for forwarding the message to the next node. “At each port, the local name of the

incoming data object is translated to the local name of that port, and that local name is used for accessing local state information and as the local name designator for the outgoing data transfers” col. 23, lines 32-35. “The routing information is part of the VC state, which is accessed based on a local VC number of that port” col. 25, lines 7-9). This clearly shows that Gopinath does not teach **“a description of a path to the first node”** as recited by claim 1.

For example, in Fig. 13 and col. 23, lines 41-50 of Gopinath, a message routing with a path of “(node S1, port 4) → (node S1, port 3) → (node S2, port 1) → (node S2, port 2)” will have the VC number sequence as “8 → 9 → 2 → 5” only. As demonstrated by this example a single VC number in the sequence can not describe a path from (node S1, port 4) to (node S2, port 2) as recited in claim 1. In Gopinath a routing path of a message can only be calculated after tracing the associated VC number sequence and corresponding information from the routing table in each intermediate node. The VC number does not contain a “description of a path to the first node” as recited in claim 1 of the present invention therefore claim 1 is allowable for at least this reason.

Independent claim 1 further requires “establishing a mapping between a plurality of output ports in the network and bits in the first address such that a packet, directed to the first address node, at a second node in the network is forwarded via an output port on the second node in the network, in response to a specified bit in the first address having a specified value.”

As discussed above, a VC number of a message, as defined in Gopinath, is a pointer to a VC status in a node. The passages cited in the Office action do not disclose **“mapping between a plurality of output ports in the network and bits in the first address.”** For example, cited portion col. 34, lines 36-61 of Gopinath only describes the content of the table inside a node used as a reference for forwarding messages. The four fields namely, host\_guards, guards, guards\_charged, and guards\_snapped contain different status information of the node, but do not contain forwarding instructions of incoming messages as recited in claim 1 of the present invention. In Gopinath the node determines the suitable output port for an incoming message after checking both the message’s VC number and the content in the table (col. 23, lines 32-35). Whereas in claim 1, “a packet, directed to the first address node, at a second node in the network is **forwarded via an output port**

**on the second node in the network, in response to a specified bit in the first address having a specified value.”** Because this limitation is also not disclosed in Gopinath the rejection of claim 1 must be withdrawn.

Independent claims 9, 11, 15, and 19 have been rejected under § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,925,097 (Gopinath). In paragraph 2.8, the rejection of claim 1 is applied to these independent claims. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least all the reasons discussed above in regards with claim 1 and request that these rejections be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 2-7, 10-14, 16-18, 20-21 are dependant claims and include all of the limitations found in their parent independent claims. These claims include further limitations which, in combination with the limitations of the parent independent claims, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the art of record and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

In view of the above Response, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed to be due for this Response. Should any fees be required, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: February 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Charles E. Miller/  
Charles E. Miller  
Registration No.: 24,576  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant